DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 441 FL 016 833

AUTHOR Kamwangamalu, Nkonko M.
TITLE Code Mixing and Modernization across Cultures.
PUB DATE May 86
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the South Asian Languages Analysis Roundtable (8th, Urbana,IL, May 29-31, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingualism; *Code Switching (Language); *Cross Cultural Studies; Developing Nations; English; French; Hindi; Kannada; *Language Attitudes; Language Patterns; Language Usage; *Language Variation; Lingala; Navajo; *Social Behavior; Spanish; Structural Analysis (Linguistics); Swahili; Tamil; Uncommonly Taught Languages; Yoruba
IDENTIFIERS India; Tanzania; Zaire

ABSTRACT

A review of recent studies addressed the functional uses of code mixing across cultures. Expressions of code mixing (CM) are not random; in fact, a number of functions of code mixing can easily be delineated, for example, the concept of "modernization." "Modernization" is viewed with respect to how bilingual code mixers perceive themselves, how they would like to be perceived, how they are actually perceived, and why they often resort to code mixing when interacting with other bilinguals with whom they share the same linguistic repertoire of codes. The first section of the paper provides a cross-cultural account for code mixing as a mark of "modernization." Several cases are drawn from studies of code mixing in various bilingual communities which show that code mixing is functionally-oriented. Section II attempts to construct the functional uses of and attitudes toward code mixing. Attitudes toward code mixing have until recently been generally negative. Nonetheless, code mixing has imposed itself as a norm for language use in every bilingual community. Section III briefly discusses the impact of code mixing on the linguistic structure of the languages involved, with particular emphasis on the vernacular. The final section discusses cases of code mixing and language change of Lingala and French in Zaire; Swahili and English in Tanzania; Spanish/Navajo and English in the United States; and Tamil/Hindi and English in India. Code mixing can bring about innovations into the structure of one or the other of the languages code-mixed. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N. Kam Wangamalu
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CODE MIXING AND MODERNIZATION ACROSS CULTURES

Nkonko M. Kamwangamalu

ED284441

1. Introduction

Code mixing[1] is one of the commonly observed linguistic behaviors in the speech of bilingual or multilingual speakers. Linguistically, code mixing is the intrasentential use of linguistic units (e.g., words, phrases, clauses) from two distinct languages by a bilingual individual within the same speech situation. The Swahili-English sentence in (1) and the Spanish-English in (2) are illustrative.

(1) Ile accident ilitokea alipolose control na akaoverturn and landed in a ditch [The accident occurred when he lost control and overturned..] (Mkilifi, 1978: 141).

(2) You didn't have to worry que somebody te iba con cerveza o una botella or something like that [You didn't have to worry that somebody was going to throw beer or a bottle at you or something like that] (Poplack, 1978: 170).

The occurrence of utterances like these in the speech of bilinguals has given rise to investigations of code mixing (CM hereafter) in several bilingual communities around the world. Studies of CM in the past ten years have been concerned with analyzing various aspects of CM (e.g., syntax, psycholinguistics, pragmatics) in individual bilingual communities of Asia, Africa, the USA, and Europe[2].

While the contribution of these studies to CM analyses cannot be underestimated, there is, however, a gap that needs to be filled: the treatment of CM as a cross-cultural phenomenon.

Paper presented at the South Asian Languages Analysis Roundtable (8th, Urbana, IL, May 29-31, 1986).

FL016833

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

By speaking of CM as a cross-cultural phenomenon, I refer to the fact that CM is observed in the speech of bilinguals and is attested to in every bilingual community around the world. In other words, it is commonly observed that bilinguals, and by extension, multilingual speakers, tend to use more than one language within the same speech situation. Such use of language, commonly referred to as CM, has been analyzed in individual bilingual communities only. However, the more one reads about CM, the more one comes to realize that CM has characteristic features one can witness in every bilingual community: CM may cause language change, CM may result in the creation of new styles and registers of language use, CM is a characteristic feature of the speech of the elite group, CM is generally perceived by some as an "impure" linguistic behavior, to list just a few. There is no single study that I know of that has addressed this dimension of CM.

The purpose of this study is to fill this gap from a functional perspective. Specifically, this paper discusses, on the basis of available recent studies, the functional uses of CM across cultures. It is argued that CM is not random, and that a number of functions can easily be delineated. One such function of CM is expressing modernization.

The concept of <u>modernization</u> is viewed here with respect to how a bilingual code-mixer perceives himself/herself, how he/she would like to be perceived, how he/she is actually perceived, and why he/she often resorts to CM when interacting with other

bilinguals with whom he/she shares the same linguistic repertoire of codes. An example of CM for expressing modernization is in order from English-Vernacular CM in African context. In Tanzania, for example, speaking English in public places (e.g., market place, bus stop, theatres, etc.) is considered as showing off or "putting on airs". Speaking the vernacular in such places would identify the speaker as old-fashioned. In order not to be associated with either of these two extremes, and to make English and the Vernacular functionally compatible with the community members' attitude toward the use of each, the Vernacular-English bilingual tends to use CM. In so doing, the bilingual perceives himself as modern, and so is he/she perceived in the community of which he/she is a member. Modernization entails then, as D'Souza (1987: 197) correctly observes, processes by which one's languages are made functionally suitable for use in new or extended domains.

Furthermore, the concept <u>modernization</u> is viewed here as a dynamic process. Also, it is assumed that modernization characterizes all languages at all times. Modernization may become identified not only with the prestige associated with a given language at a given point in time, but also the socio-economic or technological revolution evident in the society in which the language is used. The computer revolution in America for instance has brought with it a wave of new words that are now part of English lexicon. And as new techniques are increasingly being developed, there will always be a constant need to

modernize, to create or coin words to meet new concepts. Viewed from this angle, it can be said that English is undergoing a continuous process of modernization.

The paper has three main sections. Section I provides a cross-cultural account for CM as a mark of modernization. A number of cases are drawn from both personal experience and studies of CM in various bilingual communities which show that CM is functionally-oriented. Section II attempts to contrast the functional uses of and attitudes toward CM. It is noted that attitudes toward CM have until recently generally been negative. Nonetheless, CM has imposed itself as the norm for language use in every bilingual community. Section III briefly discusses the impact of CM on the linguistic structure of the languages involved, with particular emphasis on the vernacular[3].

2. Code mixing and modernization

In order to adequately address the issue of CM and modernization, two groups of languages will be distinguished: (a) transplanted languages and (b) the vernaculars. It is assumed that transplanted languages are the languages of the former colonial powers, e.g., English in India, Nigeria, and the Philippines; and French in Zaire, Senegal, and Haiti. The term "vernacular" refers to local languages in the above or any other multilingual regions.

In many third world countries, transplanted languages are associated with prestige, eliteness, and power; while the vernacular plays a secondary role and generally has a low profile

vis-à-vis the transplanted language. There are various reasons for this state of affairs: class identity, prestige, and the attitude toward the languages and what they each can achieve for the speaker in terms of job opportunities and socio-economic advancement. Viewed from this angle, CM involving a transplanted language and a vernacular therefore identifies the speaker as having a high socio-economic status, real or potential. French-vernacular CM in Zaire is a case in point. French has been the only official language in Zaire for over a century. It has been used for many years as the language of education, administration, media, diplomacy, and international business transactions. Contrary to what one would expect, French is not, however, the language of the home for the majority of Zaire's population. The latter speak a number of local languages, four of which have been recognized legally as national languages: Ciluba, Kikongo, Lingala, and Swahili. French and these languages can, following Gumperz (1982), be referred to as they-code and we-codes, respectively.

According to Gumperz, a they-code is a code that one uses to communicate with outsiders or non-group members, whereas a we-code is used for interaction with in-group members. In Zaire, we-codes are hardly code-mixed among in-group members. It is unlikely that a French-Vernacular bilingual would code-mix Lingala and Swahili, for example, or either of these with Kikongo or Ciluba.

However, CM involving any of these four languages with

French is a common and widespread practice among French-Vernacular speakers. The use of French-Vernacular CM rather than Vernacular-Vernacular CM can be explained as stemming from the socio-functional role or status assigned to French and to the Vernacular in Zaire. Social advancement in Zaire requires that the aspiring masses have at least some knowledge of French, the prestigious code, rather than the knowledge of the vernacular. Socio-functionally, French-Vernacular CM identifies the speaker with the elite class, and also with modernism and high socio-economic status, real or potential. However, Vernacular-Vernacular CM, if it ever occurs, has none of these socio-linguistic markers. The relevance of CM to modernization is marked by the abundant use of French words in a vernacular-based discourse. This is commonly observed in a variety of domains: music, higher courts, science and technology, and the media, to list just a few. I will return to this point later with examples of CM involving French or English with a number of other languages.

The use of CM for <u>modernization</u> is common practice not only in Zaire, but in other African countries as well. Mkilifi (1978) points out that in Tanzania, for example, there has been such rapid modernization through introduction of new styles of living and new technology that not only cultural but also linguistic adjustments have had to be made constantly as an individual's roles change in the community. Linguistically, these adjustments have required the use of CM in the speech of

Swahili-English bilinguals. Here also, examples of what may be called domains for modernization include, among others, higher courts, the media, higher education, science, and technology. Mkilifi points out that there is constant and unpredictable language-mixing even when discussing highly technical subjects such as zoology, medicine, or engineering. Consider, for example, the Swahili-English code-mixed sentences in (3a) and (b):

(3)a. Wambie wakupe up-to-date image ya yalitiyotokea so that you can go ahead with it ..[Tell them to give you an up-to-date image of what happened so that you..]

b. Zile hormones za uvyazi za tilapia zatigemea zile environmental factors zinazoworathiri hawa tilapia [The reproductive hormones of tilapia depend upon how the environmental factors have been impinging on tilapia] (Mkilifi, 1978: 144).

It is crucial to note here that the use of CM in these examples is not a simple case of lexical borrowing to fill lexical gaps in English or Swahili sentences, since mixing occurs even if equivalent Swahili or English lexical items exist. Constrast these examples, for the purpose of our discussion, with the Chinese-English code-mixed sentences in (4a) and (b):

(4)a. Anyway, nimen yo zhuyi participation ye suan [You must notice that participation also counts]

b. Zhege jianglai geke laoshi donhuui jiaode: ruhe yong reference, ruhe yong bibliography,.. yige point ruhe lai argue huozhe counter-argue [How to use reference, how to use bibliography.. how to argue and counter-argue a point, all these your instructor will tell you](Wu Yi An, 1985:313-315).

Certainly, Chinese lexicon has equivalents for English words

such as participation, reference, bibliography, argue, and counter-argue. Why then does the Chinese-English bilingual tend to use English lexical items in a Chinese-based discourse? This is where the concept modernization comes into the picture. It may be that the English items listed are more expressive than their Chinese equivalents, or that the latter sound old-fashioned from a Chinese-English code-mixer's point of view.[4]

A case of linguistic adjustment similar to the Tanzania case is observed in Agheyisi's (1977) study of language interlarding in the speech of Yoruba-English bilinguals in Nigeria. Agheyisi notes that "interlarded speech" is a characteristic feature of most educated urban dwellers, of undergraduates, and that it is commonly used in advanced educational institutions. This educated elite of urban communities constitutes, in the case of Nigeria as well as any other developing country, a highly influential social group whose values and patterns of both social and linguistic behavior serve as a model to imitate for the aspiring masses. An example of Yoruba-English interlarded speech is given in (5).

(5) Kinni morpheme yen .. ntori problem yen oprove difficult, sort of. Seeri nkanti mo-try lati ask niseyin.. seri, ni "oni-kinni kankan" yen se "o" is a separate morpheme. [That thing about morpheme... because that problem .. it proved difficult, sort of. You know, something that I tried to ask previously.. you know that "Oni-kinni kankan" is that "o" is a separate morpheme] (Agheyisi, 1977:102)

Here, the Yoruba-English bilingual does certainly have Yoruba equivalents for English words such as morpheme, problem,

prove, try, and ask, to list just a few. And even if there were no Yoruba equivalents for terms such as morpheme, the bilingual would have recourse to nativization to fill the gap. Why then does the Yoruba-English bilingual tend, instead, to have recourse to CM? First, words such as morpheme are technical terms which do not lend themselves easily to nativization. Such words, therefore, require a certain linguistic adjustment as suggested in Mkilifi (1978). The adjustment could be made through either nativization or code mixing. Nativization would involve complete phonological, morphological, and syntactic integration of a term like morpheme into the system of the receiving or host language, here, Yoruba. CM, however, will require no such integration. Second, CM and nativization have totally different connotations from a Yoruba-English bilingual's point of view. By using a nativized form of the word morpheme, the Yoruba-English bilingual would sound old-fashioned to his/her interlocutors. However, the opposite connotation (e.g., being perceived as modern or up-to-date) obtains when the bilingual uses CM. This explains why if the elite class members choose between these two strategies, they will prefer CM to nativization. Also, the choice in this case is obviously a function of the prestige associated with not only CM, but also with one of the other languages involved, English.

The linguistic behavior described here is also attested to in other multilingual communities around the world. For example, Sridhar (1978) reports the case of an irate Kannada-

English speaker who, outraged by his prospective so -in-law's demand of dowry, writes him the following letter:

(6) Kshamisu, dear boy, na:nu use ma:duda strong language-u esh to: control-ma: dok martubittu mannello: halli: kade:l huttid commercial minded gama:ra anta tilkoudu holly alliance of marriage arrange-ma: do: sacred occasion-nally dowry eshtu anta ke: -lti: yalla, man blood-u boiling point-ge barde iddi-te?

[Forgive me, dear boy, I tried so much to control the language that I used. But on this sacred occasion of arranging the holly alliance of marriage, forgetting that I am educated, a man of culture, broadminded, and taking me for a village-born, commercial-minded rustic, you ask me how much "dowry" I would give! Wouldn't my blood come to a boiling point?](Sridhar, 1978:10).

In this discourse, education or modernization is conveyed through CM. Here also, the speaker uses CM not because he lacks equivalent Kannada words for the corresponding English ones, rather, he deliberately mixes Kannada with English to mark his being modern, educated and his belonging to a high socio-economic class. Annamalai (1978) found in a similar study that the amount of mixing that occurs in a code-mixed variety corresponds to the level of education of the speaker and is an indicator of membership in the elite group. Belonging in this group or being counted among its members is the main reason why even those who have little or no education at all are often observed to throw a few "they-code" words into their vernacular to sound educated. The code-mixed variety thus serves, for such people, as a model of speech to imitate or with which to identify.

The use of CM for modernization was observed centuries ago

in the history of language contact. As early as the 8th Century AD, when Sanskrit was the symbol of knowledge and culture in India, CM with Sanskrit was meant to denote the position and the professional identity of the speaker (Pandharipande, 1983: 110). In this regard, Pandharipande points out that although the distribution of language in the creative literature of that time was based on such factors as sex and professions, among others, a character could mix any language assigned to him or her with Sanskrit to display modernness, sophistication, intelligence, etc. In the play Mrcchakatikam, for example, women are observed to code-mix Prakrt, the language assigned to them, with Sanskrit for the reason just mentioned.

Similarly, Latin used to be code-mixed with other European languages (e.g., Italian, French, English) to display modernization (Kahane and Kahane, 1979). Other cases could be listed which would attest that modernization is a dynamic process. The dynamicity of the concept modernization could probably be better understood in the context of the prestige associated with a given language at a given point in time.

For the purpose of our discussion, let us reconsider CM involving Hindi with Sanskrit or English in India. It was pointed out in the foregoing discussion that Sanskrit was the prestige language in India, much as is English today. In a number of functional roles, English has now acquired great prestige in India, and has become a symbol of modernization. However, Sanskritization is still common for other identity

functions: caste identity, religious identity, and literary criticism (Kachru, 1978:37). The shift of prestige from Sanskrit to English can be explained as the result of the technological revolution associated with English since early this century, which contributed tremendously to the spread and prestige of English throughout the world.

To sum up, the foregoing discussion has attempted to show, on the basis of both personal experience and studies of CM in various bilingual communities, that CM involving transplanted languages and local languages is a mark of modernization. The connection between CM and modernization has been portrayed in such domains as education, literature, science, and technology. It has been noted that the introduction of western technology in the traditionally multilingual communities of Asia and Africa, for example, has required that the members of these communities make certain linguistic adjustments in order to make their languages socio-functionally suitable for use in new domains. I have shown that such adjustments are generally made through CM, rather than through other strategies such as nativization. Why then do bilinguals often tend to resort to CM? Again, this is where the concept of <u>modernization</u> comes into the picture. I have explained that CM and nativization have totally different connotations from the bilingual's standpoint. Nativization would characterize the bilingual as being old-fashioned or antiquated, whereas CM would indentify him as being modern or up-to-date. This explains why if the bilingual chooses

between these two strategies, he/she would prefer CM to nativization. The strategy of CM contributes, as Kachru (1978) observes, to placing the code-mixer in the hierarchy of the social network in which he functions. The code-mixer perceives himself and is perceived in this hierarchy, as providing a model of language use for those who do not belong to the elite class but want to be counted in it. In view of this, one would expect CM to be attitudinally welcomed in the community in which it is used. The discusssion that follows will show that although bilinguals often tend to resort to CM when interacting among themselves, their attitudes toward CM have generally been negative.

3. **Attitudes toward code mixing.**

In order to adequately discuss attitudes toward CM, it would be better to examine, first, attitudes toward bilingualism, for CM is but a by-product of bilingualism.

Whereas bilingualism is accepted as a fact of life in the traditionally bilingual societies of Asia and Africa, it has been under attack for many years in the so-called monolingual western societies[5].

From an educational point of view, for example, some scholars have contended that bilingualism is a handicap to the cognitive development of the child (Jones and Stewart, 1951; MacNamara, 1967). Other scholars have, however, doomed this contention as misleading and groundless. McLaughin (1978), for instance, has argued that concerning educational attainment,

the critical factor is command of the second language. That is, if the child has not yet mastered the language well and is tested on some content subjects in that language, poor performance is predicted. Nonetheless, McLaughin observes that as the child's command [of second language] improves, so will academic performance in subjects taught in that language (McLaughin 1978, quoted in Grosjean, 1982:224).

Conclusions like these have hardly changed people's attitudes toward bilingualism in general, and its by-products, CM, in particular. The case of teachers' attitudes toward CM by Mexican-American students in the Southwest (USA) is illustrative. Teachers in this community described their Mexican-American students as alingual. They complained that their students could speak neither English nor Spanish. The argument goes that

> they [i.e. students] just mix everything up. They take one word here and another from there and think it makes sense. You know, they don't speak any language at all (Hatch, 1976:201).

Attitudes such as these have had serious effects on bilingual individuals, who have been forced, in some contexts, to deny the value of their own linguistic behavior and creativity. Pandit (1986:17) for example presents, in this regard, the following comments by a Hindi-English speaker on the use of CM in his family:

(7) main to <u>pure</u> hindii bolanaa <u>like</u> karatii huun <u>mix</u> karane kaa to <u>question</u> hii nahiin uthataa apanii <u>daughter</u> aur <u>sons</u> ko bhii <u>pure</u> Hindii bolane <u>ko-encourage</u> karatii

huun.
[I like to speak pure Hindi. The question of mixing Hindi and English does not arise. I also encourage my daugher and sons to speak pure Hindi]

The bilingual who made these comments, while not admitting to the use of Hindi-English CM, is observed to use this same strategy as shown in the above discourse. The feeling expressed in this discourse is to be understood as the result of psychological pressure exerted on the bilingual concerned by individuals who consider CM as linguistic "pollution" or a threat to the purity of local languages.

Negative attitudes toward CM have been attested to both in speech and literature. An example of the latter is Kitti, a hero in the play referred to in Sridhar (1978:113). Due to Kitti's use of Kannada-English CM, his scout master exclaims angrily:

> Who brought you up? Where did you grow up? Good Heavens! A bunch of rowdies seems to have joined our brigade. What language do you speak? I say! One quarter Kannada?

Additionally, attitudinally loaded terms such as Hinglish, Singlish, Taglish, Tex-Mex, and Joual are evidence for negative attitudes toward mixed varieties that have developed as the result of Hindi-English CM in India, Sinahale-English in Sri Lanka, Tagalog-English in the Philipines, Spanish-English in the USA, and French-English in Canada.

Reactions similar to the Kannada-English case referred to above have also been observed in the context of African

languages as well. In Zaire, parents usually complain that their children who mix French with Lingala, Swahili or Ciluba, for example, are distancing themselves from ancestral culture and tradition. Similarly, CM with English in Nigeria, for example, is considered as corrupt, adultered, bastardized, and impure linguistic behavior (Agheyisi, 1977).

Recently, however, people's attitude toward CM has changed. The literature has shown that CM is the norm for language use in most bilingual communities. The bilingual uses CM for various reasons one of which, modernization, has been the focus in the preceding section. The use of CM, whether for modernization or any other reason, is generally accompanied by changes and innovations in the structure of the languages being code-mixed. D'Souza (1987:197) points out that modernization may result in (a) the creation of new styles and registers, (b) the introduction of new grammatical features, (c) the introduction of new discoursal and stylistic devices, (d) the introduction of new sounds, and (e) expansion of vocabulary, to list just a few. These features will be discussed in the next section, with particular emphasis on the vernacular. Cases will be presented which show that CM can bring about changes and innovations into a language.

4. Code mixing and language structure

The cases of CM and language change to be discussed in this section include the following: (a) Lingala-French in Zaire, (b) Swahili-English in Tanzania, (c) Spanish/Navajos-English in

the United States, and (d) Tamil/Hindi-English in India.

a. **Lingala-French.**

As I mentioned above, French has been used for a little over a century as the only official language in Zaire. With this status, French has had considerable influence on the structure of local languages, especially Lingala, Swahili, Kikongo, and Ciluba. The influence of French on these languages echoes at all linguistic levels: phonology, lexicon, morphology, and syntax. Let us consider the following Lingala-French code-mixed sentence:

(8) L'heure ya kala trois quarts ya ba-jeunes bazali ko-comprendre avenir te, mais sikoyo na quatre quarts, trois quarts baza ko-comprendre l'avenir mpe la plupart bakoti kelasi [In the past, three fourths of youngmen did not care about the future, but now, three out of four fourths do care and most do go to school](Mobutu Sese Seko[6]).

Phonologically, the sound [r] (as in trois, comprendre) is being introduced into Lingala sound-system. This innovation is the result of Lingala-French CM. Other phonological potential innovations include consonant clusters such as [pl] (as in plupart 'most'), and [kr] (as in krize 'crisis'). These clusters might, over the long run, become part of Lingala phonological system.

Morphologically, there has developed in Lingala, as the result of Lingala-French CM, the use of a double plural (Bokamba, 1985). Words such as ba-jeunes (youngmen); ba-cahiers (notebooks), are illustrative. Ba- is a plural human-class noun prefix in Lingala. The French word jeunes is a plural form for

the corresponding singular noun jeune, and so is cahiers for cahier. However, these French plural nouns are used with the Lingala plural prefix ba-. The combination of these elements has created a double plural, a feature which does not inherently exist in either Lingala or French. Also, the use of ba- with French words such as cahiers has been overgeneralized to Lingala non-human class nouns. Examples of these are ndako/bandako (house/houses), nsoso/bansoso (chicken/chickens), kiti/bakiti (chair/chairs). Normally, nouns such as these must have the same form for both singular and plural, the difference between the two being marked only by the verbal agreement prefix as in (9a) and (b), respectively.

(9) a. Nsoso ezali awa (The chicken is here).
b. Nsoso izali awa (The chickens are here).

Syntactically, CM has introduced the use of a double infinitive in Lingala. The word ko-comprendre, for example, is made of two elements, namely, the Lingala infinitive marker ko- and the French infinitive verb comprendre 'understand'. The combination of these elements has resulted into a double infinitive, a feature which hitherto did not exist in Lingala. In addition, words in Bantu do not end with an open syllable. However, mixed items such as jeunes in ba-jeunes retain their plural marker, -s. (10a) for example is unacceptable because this marker has not been retained, while (10b) is well-formed for the opposite reason.

(10)a. *Ba-jeune bakokota te.
b. Ba-jeunes bakokota te (Youngmen will not enter).

Although cases such as (10) are not a problem in spoken Lingala, since -s is not pronounced in word final position, they are a problem in the written language as illustrated by the unacceptability of (10a).

From a lexical standpoint, thousands of French words have been nativized and entered into Lingala lexicon. Some of these words are, for example, mersi (French: merci 'thank you'); fami (famille 'family'); bonane (bonne annèe 'happy new year'). The massive nativization of French words into Lingala has created a homonymic clash between native words and the nativized ones. Lingala native words such as eboto, libota, and mbula ya sika, for example, are now part of Lingala-French speakers' passive knowledge, while the corresponding nativized ones, mersi, fami, and bonane, respectively, are more common in colloquial speech.

b. Swahili-English

The influence of Swahili-English CM in Tanzania is marked by an extension of the meaning of inherent Swahili words to match their English counterpart. Mkilifi (1978) for example discusses the utterance Umenunua fruit (Did you buy fruit?), which was produced by a Swahili-English bilingual speaker. When asked why he used the English word fruit instead of the Swahili matunda, the bilingual who produced this utterance responded that matunda is fruit on trees which you go and pick, while fruit is matunda you buy in the market.

According to Mkilifi, the use of fruit rather than matunda in this context is an innovation that extends the meaning of the existing term "matunda" or gives it a new meaning altogether to match the corresponding English term, fruit. Mkilifi points out that many new political, economic, and scientific terms have been added to Swahili in this way. The following Swahili-English extract from a tape-recorded verbal report by a research assistant includes a number of such terms: kustandardize 'to standardize', kuyasolve 'to solve it', dictionary, Research Bureau, etc.

(11) Inakuwa maana yake they go against their own wishes kustandardize, maana wengi katika legal affairs hawajastandardize bwana, matatizo haya wameweze kuyasolve kwa kutumia dictionary mpya published by the legal Research Bureau of the University (Mkilifi, 1978:140).

Consider also the Edoʔ-English CM excerpt in (12) between a Nigerian Company Director and his secretary.

(12) Director: Dial enumber nàá, n'ùinform'en Mr. Oseni ighé à approve encontracti nii né. But khámáà rén ighé ó ghà yé necessary n'ó submit-e photostat copies òghé estimate n'ó kà yá apply à ké pay èré. You understand?

[Dial this number, and inform Mr. Oseni that we approved the contract already. But tell him that it will still be necessary for him to submit photostat copies of estimate that he first applied with before we pay him. You understand?]

Secretary: Yes Sir! Dèghé è í rr' office, n'í dial his house? [If he is not in the office, should I dial his house? (Agheyisi, 1977:100)

Here also, terms such as photostat, copies, and estimate have, because of the linguistic adjustment mentioned above, found their way into Edo via CM.

From a syntactic point of view, adverbs in Swahili traditionally occur in sentence final position, but not in sentence initial position. However, there is now in various registers of Swahili a tendency to use adverbs in sentence initial position. The following is a case in point.

(13)a. Jambo hili nizuri kielimu (Swahili syntax)
[This (matter) is an advantage, educationally].
b. Kielimu jambo hili nizuri (English syntax)
[Educationally, this (matter) is an advantage].

Here, the adverb kielimu must normally occur at the end of the sentence as in (13a). However, due to the influence of English on Swahili via CM, (13a) is commonly rendered as in (13b), with the adverb occur in sentence initial position.

c. Spanish/Navajos-English

Language change as the result of CM is evident not only in Bantu languages, but in other languages as well. Pfaff (1979) for instance notes that English nouns used in a Spanish-English mixed variety are generally assigned Spanish gender, even in those cases where no such gender is specified in English. English nouns such as community and responsibility, for example, are assigned the feminine gender una (e.g., una community) and la (e.g., la responsibility), respectively. Also, even in those communities where it is believed that speakers do not mix languages, innovations do indeed take place whenever speakers

are exposed to other languages. Holm, Holm, and Spolsky (1973) found that despite the long-standing notion that Navajos do not mix languages, the Navajos-English bilinguals they observed did indeed use English vocabulary items while speaking Navajos. For instance, enclitics were frequently attached to English words as in shi-little sister 'my little sister', shi-pants 'my pants', book-ish 'it is a book', dormitory-goo 'towards the dormitory', etc.

d. **Tamil/Hindi-English**

Innovations and language change have been observed for CM involving not only pairs of languages such as those discussed thus far, but also English and Indian languages as well. These innovations have been observed at all linguistic levels. However, the discussion that follows will be limited to lexical innovations and phonological change in Tamil, and syntactic change in Hindi. Concerning Tamil, Annamalai (1978) found that generic terms such as furniture and specific terms like the color names brown, dark brown, light brown, etc., which were hitherto non-existent in Tamil, are now being used as the result of Tamil-English CM. Furthermore, Annamalai points out that since these words are pronounced the way they are in their source language, English, they have introduced new sets of phonemes in Tamil phonemic system.

In the case of Hindi syntax, Kachru (1978) has noted the following innovations. Traditionally, for example, no distinction was made in Hindi discourse between direct and indirect speech.

However, Kachru points out that most Hindi speakers are now observed to produce utterances such as "NP said that he will read...", which follows the English syntax, rather than the Hindi "NP said that I will read..". Furthermore, the surface word order of Hindi is SOV as opposed to the SVO word order of English. Nonetheless, it has been observed that there has emerged in recent years a tendency to use an SVO structure in various styles of Hindi (Kachru, 1978:42).

In summary, the foregoing discussion has attempted to show that CM can bring about innovations into the structure of one or the other of the languages code-mixed. For more "conservative" languages such as French, the innovations generally occur vertically, that is, from the prestigious (or transplanted) code, French, into the less prestigious code: the vernacular. For CM involving a "more flexible and permissive language"[8] such as English with another language, innovations may occur in either direction, i.e., from English into that language and vice-versa.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have tried to demonstrate that CM is a cross-cultural phenomenon. Three points have been considered which attest to this claim: the functional uses of CM, attitudes towards CM, and language change as the result of CM.

From a functional point of view, I have focussed on CM as a mark of <u>modernization</u>. The use of CM for modernization is attested to in a variety of domains: education, literature,

science, and techonology, to list just a few. Also, I have pointed out that the use of CM, whether for modernization or any other functions, is a characteristic feature of the speech of the elite group or those who hold a higher socio-economic status in their respective communities. CM is both to these speakers and the aspiring masses a model of language use with which to identify.

In attitudinal terms, it has been shown that although CM proves to be the norm of speech most observed in bilingual communities around the world, bilinguals do not always admit to it. This is because CM is considered by some as a "corrupt" and an "impure" linguistic behavior. Recall for example, from Section III, the reaction of Kitti's scout master against Kitti's use of Kannada-English CM (Sridhar, 1978), and the case of a Hindi-English bilingual who does not admit that he uses Hindi-English CM in his family (Pandit, 1986). I have, despite these attitudes, contended that instances of CM will always be observed whenever two or more languages come into contact. It has been argued that if such contact takes place, there will result not only CM but also changes and innovations in the structure of the languages involved. The discussion of CM and language structure covered in Section IV has shown that CM for modernization can result in (a) expansion of the vocabulary of the languages code-mixed (Mkilifi, 1978); (b) the introduction of sets of new sounds (Annamalai, 1978; Kamwangamalu, 1987); (c) the introduction of new grammatical

features (Bokamba, 1985; Kachru, 1978) and (d) the creation of new styles and registers of language use (Weil, 1977; Jacobson, 1978; Kachru, 1983). CM, therefore, proves to be of considerable significance to not only synchronic analyses of language in bilingual communities, but also, to current theories of language use and language analysis.

It is, however, especially important to note here Hymes' (1981) remarks concerning trends in current linguistic research. This research, whether into formal grammar or past affinities, has tended to focus attention on a single form of a language- the "deepest" or most "basic," grammatically, or the oldest, historically. Seldom has attention gone to the full repertoire of a community, the full range of its varieties of language, the variety of registers within language, the variety of purposes for which such registers and varieties of language are employed, and the relations among those purposes.

It seems, as Hymes observes further, that personal shame (as attested to in this paper) and institutional policies have, instead, taken their toll and turned some people (e.g., children of immigrants in the United States) monolingual in the so-called monolingual societies in the Western World. However, such policies have not succeeded in their effort to exterminate bilingualism, or its by-products, CM, in particular. For example, the fact that English, a former immigrant language, is heard throughout the United States has not prevented other immigrant languages (e.g., Italian, Spanish, Norwegian,

French, and German) from not only being spoken, but also mixed with English. In that respect, CM sheds light on the current life of languages in bilingual communities around the world and deserves, therefore, more attention as a serious object of linguistic inquiry than it ever has received.

NOTES

1. The term CM has often been misused for related terms such as code switching and borrowing. CM differs from code switching in that the latter is linguistically an intersentential phenomenon, while the former is intrasentential. Both CM and code switching differ from borrowing in that the latter entails integration of the borrowed item into the system of the borrowing language. For a more elaborate discussion on the difference between CM, code switching and borrowing, see Sridhar & Sridhar, 1980; Kachru, 1983, and Kamwangamalu, 1987.

2. See, e.g. for Asia, Annamalai, 1971, 1978; Kachru, 1978, 1983; Bautista, 1975; Marasigan, 1983; Wu Yi An, 1983; for America, Timm, 1975, 1978; Pfaff, 1976, 1979; Lipski, 1977; Wentz, 1977; McClure, 1978; Valdes-Fallis, 1979; Caballes, 1980; for Africa, Parkin, 1974; Agheyisi, 1977; Mkilifi, 1978; Bokamba, 1985; and for Europe, Kahane and Kahane, 1979; Grosjean, 1982; Hartular, 1983; Sobin, 1984.

3. The term <u>vernacular</u> has not been clearly defined in the literature. Some have interpreted the term as synonymous of inferior language and the like. In this study, however, the term <u>vernacular</u> refers to local or indigeneous languages as opposed

to "foreign" or "transplanted" language.

4. CM can be used for a variety of reasons besides modernization: to quote someone, to specify addressee, to emphasize a message, to convey confidentiality, to put on airs, to show off education, to express group or class identity, etc. These and many other functions of CM are determined by the variables of the context of situation: the participants in a conversation, the topic of the conversation, and the setting in which the conversation takes place.

5. Recently, for example, a number of cities (e.g. Miami, California) in the United States have voted for laws which promote the use of English only in school, local governmemt and administration. Such laws may have been motivated by all or any of the following: language loyalty, prestige, identity, to list just a few. The question that seems to be overlooked in all this is whose language loyalty, whose linguistic identity, or whose language prestige should be favored at the expense of others' and why?

6. Edo is one of the vernaculars spoken in the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

7. Mobutu Sese Seko is president of the Republic of Zaire in Central Africa.

8. I have used the phrase more flexible and permissive language here for contrast with the term conservative, associated here with French. Contact between English and local languages in former British or American colonies has resulted in the emergence

of worldwide recognized varieties of non-natives Englishes (Kachru, 1985). This, however, has not been the case with French for example in former French colonies. This fact alone underlies the conservative nature of French vis-à-vis English.

REFERENCES

AGHEYISI, R.N. (1977) "Language interlarding in the speech of Nigerians." In: Language and linguistic problems in Africa. Edited by P.F.A. Kotey and H. Der-Houssikiam. Columbia: Hornbeam Press, pp. 99-110.

AN, WU YI (1985) "Code mixing by English-Chinese bilingual teachers of the People's Republic of China." In: World Englishes 4, 3: 303-317.

ANNAMALAI, E. (1978) "The Anglicized Indian languages: A case study of code mixing." In: International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics 7: 239-247.

BOKAMBA, E.G. (1985) "Code mixing, language variation, and linguistic theory: Evidence from Bantu languages." Paper read at the 16th ACAL, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, March 21-23.

D'Souza, J. (1987) South Asia as a sociolinguistic area. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.

GROSJEAN, F. (1982) Life with two languages. Cambridge: Havard University Press.

GUMPERZ, J.J. (1982) "Conversational code switching." In:J.J. Gumperz, 1982. Discourse strategies, London: Cambridge

University Press, pp. 55-99.

HATCH, E. (1976) "Studies in language switching and mixing." In: Language and Man: Anthropological issues. Edited by W.C. McCormick and S.A. Wurm. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 201-214.

HOLM, A., W. HOLM, B. SPOLSKY (1973) "English loan words in the speech of young Navajo children,". In: Bilingualism in the Southwest. Edited by P.R. Turner. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, pp. 227-239.

HYMES, D.H. (1981) "Foreword". In: Language in the USA. Edited by C.A. Ferguson and S.B. Heath. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. V-IX.

JACOBSON, R. (1978) "Code switching in South Texas." In: Journal of the linguistic association of the Southwest 3.1: 20-32.

JONES, W., and W. STEWART (1951) "Bilingualism and verbal intelligence." In: British Journal of Psychology 4: 3-8.

KACHRU, B.B. (1978) "Code mixing as a communicative strategy in India." In: J. Allatis, ed., International dimensions of bilingual education, pp. 107-124.

-----(1983) "On mixing." In: B.B. Kachru, 1983. The Indianization of English, Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp, 193-207.

KAHANE, H., and KAHANE, R. (1979) "Decline and survival of Western prestige languages." In: Language 55: 183-198.

KAMWANGAMALU, Nkonko M. (1987) "The pragmatics of code mixing with English: The case of African languages." Paper read at

the Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, April 17-18.

MACNAMARA, J. (1967) "The bilingual's linguistic performance: A psychological overview." In: Journal of social issues 23: 58-77.

McCLURE, E. (1977) "Aspects of code switching in the discourse of bilingual Mexican-American children." In: Georgetown Round Table on Language and Linguistics, pp. 93-115.

McLAUGHIN, D. (1978) Second language acquisition in childhood. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate.

MKILIFI, A.M.A. (1978) "Triglossia and Swahili-English bilingualism in Tanzania." In: Advances in the study of of societal multilingualism. Edited by J. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 129-149.

PANDHARIPANDE, R. (1983) "Mixing and creativity in multilingual India." In: Studies in the linguistic sciences 13.2: 99-115.

PANDIT, Ira. (1985) Hindi-English code switching: Mixed Hindi-English. Delhi: Datta Book Centre.

PFAFF, C.W. (1979) "Constraints on language mixing." In: Language 55: 291-318.

POPLACK, S. (1978) "Syntactic structure and social function of code switching." In: Latino language and communicative behavior. Edited by R. Duran. Norwood: New Jersey, pp. 169-184.

SESEP N'SIAL, B. (1978) Le mètissage Français-Lingala au Zaire:

Essai d'analyse différentielle et sociolinguistique de la communauté bilingue. Unpublished Thése de doctorat de 3éme cycle, Université de Nice, Nice, France.

SRIDHAR, S.N. (1978) "On the function of code mixing in Kannada." In: International journal of the sociology of language 16: 109-117.

WEIL, S. (1977) "Verbal interaction among the Bene Israel." In: International journal of the sociology of language 13: 71-85.